

the plurality of truss spans having a tapered profile and a stacked configuration where a first truss span nests inside of a second truss span when the first truss span is inserted between the two structural end brackets of the second truss span,

wherein the hub includes a cylindrical wall, and a set of pre-formed holes for use to fasten connection members to the hub.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, 10, 13, 19, 21, 23, 34 and 35 have been amended, claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 22 canceled and claims 37 – 43 have been added. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21 and 23 – 43 are now pending in the application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 26-33 and finding claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20 – 25 and 36 to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The present response to the Office Action dated March 9, 2007 is being filed on June 11, 2007. The three-month date from the March 9, 2007 mailing date of the Office Action was June 9, 2007 which fell on a Saturday. According to 37 C.F.R. 1.7(a), the period for taking action in such a case is extended until the next succeeding business day which is not a Saturday, Sunday or a Federal holiday. In this case, that day is Monday June 11, 2007. As a result, the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider this response as being timely filed within the three-month period for response.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 14, 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith (3,670,471). Claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19 and 20-25 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the language of dependent claim 6 which was found to be allowable. As such, Applicant asserts claim 1 as amended is in condition for allowance. Claim 6 has been canceled and claim 7 has been amended to now depend from claim 1. Because claims 4, 5 and 7 depend from and further limit what is believed to be

allowable claim 1, claims 4, 5 and 7 are also believed to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant requests allowance of claims 1, 4, 5 and 7.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim 1 and the intervening claim 2. Consequently, claim 37 has been added combining the subject matter of claims 1, 2 and 3. As a result, it is believed that claim 37 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests allowance of claim 37.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim 1 and the intervening claim 8. Consequently, claim 38 has been added combining the subject matter of claims 1, 8 and 9. As a result, it is believed that claim 38 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests allowance of claim 38.

Independent claim 10 has been amended to include the language of dependent claim 18 which was found to be allowable. As a result, it is believed that claim 10 as amended is in condition for allowance. Claim 18 has been canceled and claim 19 has been amended to now depend from claim 10. Because claims 14, 17 and 19 depend from and further limit what is believed to be allowable claim 10, claims 14, 17 and 19 are also believed to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant requests allowance of claims 10, 14, 17 and 19.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim 10. Consequently, claim 39 has been added combining the subject matter of claims 10 and 11. As a result, it is believed that claim 39 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests allowance of claim 39.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim 10. Consequently, claim 40 has been added combining the subject matter of claims 10 and 12. As a result, it is believed that claim 40 is in condition for allowance. Because claim 13 depends from and further limits what is believed to be allowable claim 40, claim 13 is also believed to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant requests allowance of claims 40 and 13.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim 10 and the intervening claim 15. Consequently, claim 41 has been added combining the subject matter of claims 10, 15 and 16. As a result, it is believed that claim 41 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests allowance of claim 41.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim 10 and claim 20. Consequently, claim 42 has been added combining the subject matter of claims 10 and 20. As a result, it is believed that claim 42 is in condition for allowance. Because claim 21 depends from and further limits what is believed to be allowable claim 42, claim 21 is also believed to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant requests allowance of claims 42 and 21.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim 10 and claim 22. Consequently, claim 43 has been added combining the subject matter of claims 10 and 22. As a result, it is believed that claim 43 is in condition for allowance. Because claims 23 – 25 depend from and further limit what is believed to be allowable claim 43, claims 23 – 25 are also believed to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant requests allowance of claims 43 and 23 - 25.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21 and 23 – 43 are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is requested to allow the claims. Should the Examiner find it useful, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (651) 484-1032 with any questions or comments he may have.

Respectfully submitted,

Applicant

Dated: June 11, 2007

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Curtis D. Kinghorn", written over a horizontal line.

Curtis D. Kinghorn
SIRIUS STRATEGIC, LLC
Reg. No.33,926
6769 W. Shadow Lake Dr.
Lino Lakes, MN 55014
Telephone: (651) 484-1032